UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF VERMONT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff,)	Case No: 2:11-cr-00087-wks-1
VS.)	2.11 CI 00007 WRS 1
TERRY VAN MEAD, Defendant.)	

RESENTENCING Monday, May 11, 2015 Burlington, Vermont

BEFORE:

THE HONORABLE WILLIAM K. SESSIONS, III District Judge

APPEARANCES:

TIMOTHY C. DOHERTY, ESQ., U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE 11 Elmwood Avenue, 3d Floor, P.O. Box 570 Burlington, VT 05401

STEVEN L. BARTH, ESQ., FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER'S OFFICE, 126 College Street, Suite 410 Burlington, VT 05401

Probation Officer: John P. Bendzunas

Deputy Clerk: Joanne Muir

Court Reporter: Kim U. Sears, RPR

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.
P.O. BOX 329
BURLINGTON, VERMONT 05402-0329
(802/800) 863-6067

E-MAIL: info@capitolcourtreporters.com

```
2
    MONDAY, MAY 11, 2015
1
2
     (The following was held in open court at 11:05 a.m.)
 3
                    THE COURT: Good morning.
                    MR. DOHERTY: Good morning.
 4
 5
                    MR. BARTH: Good morning.
 6
                    DEPUTY CLERK: This is case number 11-87,
 7
    United States of America vs. Terry Mead. The Government
8
    is present through Assistant United States Attorney Tim
 9
    Doherty. The Defendant is present via video conferencing.
    Present in the courtroom on behalf of the Defendant is
10
    Assistant Federal Public Defender Steven Barth.
11
12
                    The matter before the court is
13
    resentencing.
14
                    THE COURT: All right. This is a
15
    resentencing. Mr. Mead, can you hear us today?
16
                    MR. MEAD: Yes, I can, Your Honor.
17
                    THE COURT: Okay. I have before me a
18
    request for permission to participate in the hearing via
    video conference and a waiver of your right to be present.
19
20
    Have you had an opportunity to go over that request with
21
    Mr. Barth?
22
                    MR. MEAD: Yes, I have.
23
                    THE COURT: And this is your signature here
24
    on the form?
25
                    MR. MEAD: Yes, it is, sir.
                                                 Yes.
```

```
3
                    THE COURT: And you wish to proceed to your
1
2
     sentencing via video conference?
 3
                    MR. MEAD: Yes, Your Honor.
                    THE COURT: Have you had an adequate
 4
 5
     opportunity to talk to Mr. Barth in advance of the
 6
    hearing?
 7
                    MR. MEAD: Yes, we have.
8
                    THE COURT: Okay. All right. The court
9
    will grant your request for permission to participate in
     the hearing via video conferencing.
10
                    Again, I've read the presentence report,
11
12
     read the same sentencing report that was submitted
13
     initially. You have received a copy of that report, Mr.
    Barth?
14
                    MR. BARTH: The initial one?
15
16
                    THE COURT: Initial.
17
                    MR. BARTH: Oh absolutely, yes.
                    THE COURT: And you have gone over that
18
    with your client?
19
20
                    MR. BARTH: Yes, Your Honor.
21
                    THE COURT: Any factual mistakes in the
     report?
22
23
                    MR. BARTH: No, Your Honor.
24
                    THE COURT: Other than obviously the
     calculation is different based upon the second circuit's
25
```

4 1 opinion on United States vs. Day. 2 MR. BARTH: Yes. 3 THE COURT: That one? All right. Mead, have you gone over the report again with Mr. Barth? 4 5 MR. MEAD: Yes, we have. 6 Did you see any mistakes in the THE COURT: 7 report? 8 MR. MEAD: We discussed the facts and 9 things there, and I didn't see any mistakes. No. 10 THE COURT: Okay. And Mr. Doherty, any 11 errors? 12 MR. DOHERTY: No, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: All right. Again I've read the 14 I've read the sentencing memoranda submitted by the defense. I went over the various exhibits that were 15 16 attached to the report including the 18-page summary of 17 Mr. Mead's adjustment at Petersburg. And so the defense's 18 request is for a non-guideline sentence, and I'll hear you 19 on that request. Thank you, Your Honor. 20 MR. BARTH: Yes. 21 When I stood before this court with Mr. Mead next to me, and this court imposed sentence, I recall very clearly as 22 23 the court regularly does, it gave some advice to Mr. Mead 24 to change his life. It was not unlike advice that counsel 25 had tried to impart both before and after sentencing. And

one hopes that a client, a Defendant, standing before the court will listen and take those things to heart and make an attempt to change his or her life.

And so often we don't know because the Defendant, the client, never ends up before the same court again. Often it's the opposite; client or Defendant ends up before the court. However, in this case because of the second circuit's opinion in *U.S. v. Mead* we do know that Mr. Mead took this court's words to heart, took counsel's advice to heart, and most importantly made a decision on his own to change his life.

Now one thing that Mr. Mead has wanted me to communicate to both the probation officer, to this court, and I'm sure based on the court's comments at the beginning of this hearing it would know this, neither counsel nor Mr. Mead had any expectation that this case would necessarily come back before the court. I felt strongly that our argument was persuasive based on the --going back and reading the court's opinion on this, I think the court may have even thought the argument was somewhat persuasive, although maybe I'm reading too much into it. But there was Day. And Day was binding on this court obviously. The court had seemingly very little leeway to get around Day.

And what's interesting about Mead is that I

believe it was Judge Livingston who authored the opinion in Mead who also authored the opinion in Day. Seemingly one might argue doing a bit of pivot. The reason I bring this up is Mr. Mead's concern that this court, the probation officer and counsel might believe he sustained this good behavior for these years simply thinking that this case would come back. And certainly I never imparted that belief in him, and he never believed that. I can tell you he was extremely surprised when I spoke to him after the decision was made.

Despite not believing that he would ever be before this court again awaiting sentencing, Mr. Mead has had a sea change in both his -- in his behavior and his attitude. I want to stress to you that shortly after the Day case was -- I'm sorry, after the Mead case was published, I got a call from Petersburg. There were two COs on the phone. They were concerned because they now had a presentencing detainee in general population at an FCI. And they were concerned that they had to put Mr. Mead into segregation for liability purposes.

Now I've never heard of this before, but they wanted to talk through with me. I told them, of course, they had no liability issues, and they should not put him in segregation, and ultimately that's the choice they made. But this was the first indication that I had

that there had been a dramatic change in Mr. Mead's attitude. Because both of those correctional officers had nothing but nice things to say about Mr. Mead. I think I would have been hard pressed to find similar comments from correctional officers and U.S. Marshals pretrial. And what they said was that at that time he was the orderly in the associate warden's office. That is a privilege only given to one inmate after that inmate has proven themselves, and if they continue to prove themselves, they do not rotate any other inmates through that job because it is such a sensitive job. They want to keep somebody there that they trust. And Mr. Mead has maintained their trust and remains in the associate warden's office as the orderly.

In addition to earning the trust through his hard work and remaining free from infraction, he's taken serious steps to better his life by taking advantage of the programming that is available to him at Petersburg. I've attached several certificates to show the court that he has done his best to improve himself both physically, mentally and emotionally.

But in addition to that, Your Honor, Mr.

Mead has been proactive in looking forward beyond the

walls of the Petersburg facility. As the court has seen,

Mr. Mead has taken steps to regain the trust of his

family, and regain the trust of some of the folks in the community.

THE COURT: Well there was -- there are a couple of different documents that were somewhat inconsistent about whether in fact he has made progress at reuniting with the family. First, there is a reference in one particular page to him having a whole lot more contact with his children.

MR. BARTH: Yes.

which is -- I think it's even following, which suggests that he's still having difficulty reuniting with the family, but he's making efforts. What is the level of his communication with the kids, and in particular his reintegration with the family or plans for reintegration with the family?

MR. BARTH: Yes. So as far as giving you with what regularity Mr. Mead is in contact with his children, I can't tell you. But we have spoken about this recently. We spoke about it even just before the court took the bench.

Your Honor, I think he's made great strides. I think from -- the impression I have from Mr.

Mead is that he has regular contact with his children now, that it has been a process, but that he is in regular

contact with his children. He just mentioned, I think for the first time this morning, that he also has reconnected with the mother of his children, and if I'm wrong about where I've misinterpreted something he's told me, I'm sure he will correct me when he has a chance to speak to Your Honor. But he has made great strides in reconnecting with his children.

I can tell you, Your Honor, that even before he was sent to FCI Petersburg one of the most important things to Mr. Mead was his children. I'm sure Mr. Mead remembers this, but he had his family send us, and we collected, I think, from some of the things that were in his property that was seized, a number of pictures. And some of it, if I may is -- my memory is coming back to me, was sent to us or we picked up when he was transferred from facility to facility.

The most important thing that -- to Mr.

Mead that he wanted to make sure we got back to him were the pictures and letters of his children and from his children. So that has been a constant motivator in Mr.

Mead's life, but it appears and certainly he can address this, that he has earned their trust and is in regular contact in particular with his children.

In that report I would note, I think it is somewhat -- it's somewhat dated, I think they do them

every six months or so. In any event, I think there's been great strides in that regard. I also attached a letter from Ms. Long, Mr. Cresinger. He, Mr. Mead, has taken steps not only to better himself while he's in custody, but to make sure that he has a secure place to land once he's released. He's going to have a place to stay, and he is going to have a job. Those things have been promised to him by Ms. Long and Mr. Cresinger and that is what Mr. Mead plans to do.

I also understand that -- from Ms. Long that there are some plans to help Mr. Mead get into school so that he is in school part time while he's working as well. And I mentioned this in my paperwork, but Mr. Mead has been saving his money. At the time I talked to him about that last he had saved up about \$6,400 in his account. He now has \$6,700 in his account. So he's done everything one could hope that a person in his position would do such that the court can be reasonably assured he won't be committing new crimes and facing new sentencing in the future.

For those reasons, and pursuant to the Supreme Court's holding in Pepper, we think that the court should take those things into consideration and vary downward from the guidelines from a low-end sentence of 92 months to a relatively modest variation to 75 months.

THE COURT: Yes.

society.

THE COURT: All right. Do you wish to say anything, Mr. Mead?

MR. MEAD: Your Honor, can you hear me?

MR. MEAD: The only thing I wanted to say was Mr. Barth is correct. I did take the words to heart. I didn't have any plans on the deal going through because I didn't plan -- I mean I did most of it for myself and my kids to make sure when I am released that I will be financially secure, I'll have better life for my kids. Right now I'm just E-mailing them letters, and also I established like Mr. Barth said, guarantee of employment and housing from the people that can help me, and they are supporting me a hundred percent no matter when I'm released so this way I can be a productive member of

And he also told you that I worked for the associate warden which is directly working in the warden's office as an orderly. I also work on the compound for the captain. I have had no infractions. I've stayed shute free this whole time I have been in Petersburg. I realized I was a mess and I just knew that I couldn't do it anymore.

THE COURT: So what was it that turned this around here, Mr. Mead? Because when you were in court

here you, to say the least, were a mess.

MR. MEAD: Yes. I understand that. And to be honest, I think what it is, both my kids were -- before they were younger kids. Now they are turned to teenagers I'm realizing how much I missed.

THE COURT: What kind of contact do you have with them?

MR. MEAD: Right now it's through E-mail with their mom. I have both their Email addresses and letters. I have a few hundred pictures that they sent me. I send them pictures back and forth. I try to get them gifts, they do drawings and stuff for me on the holidays. The phone is kind of difficult because they are 16 hours ahead of us right now. But either my mom -- I have contact with my mother now. She moved back to Vermont. And she knows I'm here, and she is doing her best.

So I figured if I fail -- I get paid from the social work, I get paid \$96. I put 90 dollars in my savings and \$6 on my account so I can contact my children. I don't spend my money. I save that because I know when I get out I don't want to be dependent on society. I want to be self dependent and be able to help my children wherever I can, whenever I can because they have helped me. Trying to do something good.

THE COURT: All right. So your plans -- I

mean I read the letter about the employment that's been offered to you. And they obviously are going to provide housing. That is your plan when you're released?

MR. MEAD: My plan is to, yes, work for Amy and Toby, and they have like 50 houses, apartments. I'm going to live in one of their apartments. Eventually I'm going to take over their detailing company. They have a detailing company also. And we are going to build houses for them. They build a lot of houses which I like to do. And keep moving.

THE COURT: So I noticed that you couldn't get in the 500-hour program so -- within three years of your release date. Is the 500-hour program available at Petersburg?

MR. MEAD: Yes, there is one. I did do a short one originally.

THE COURT: Right. I saw that.

MR. MEAD: Right. They were waiting close to my release because when you sentenced me you said close to my release to do the program. And I believe it wasn't until 2012, so we were working on it before the case manager changed.

THE COURT: All right. All right. Okay. Is there anything else that you want to say?

MR. MEAD: Yes. I just want to apologize

for the way I acted before. That whole thing -- just in the fact that I've changed considerably from what I was before, in my opinion, from my attorney's opinion, just in the fact that shows that I did it because I knew I needed to.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Mr. Doherty, do you want to respond?

MR. DOHERTY: Your Honor, when Ms. Nolan filed her sentencing memo back in 2012 she went through the 3553(a) factors and argued those factors militated in favor of 130 months' sentence. In the government's view those factors are still in play. They still militate in favor of a guideline sentence in this case.

Mr. Van Mead has 21 criminal history points. He has a long track record of violence, brutal violence, in some instances predatory behavior toward women, young women frequently. In the Government's view at this point the defense is asking for the court to essentially come close anyway to cutting his previously imposed sentence in half.

The Government just does not think it's warranted. So we submit that a guideline sentence somewhere within that 92 to 115-month range is appropriate under the 3553(a) factors.

THE COURT: Okay. Any response, Mr. Barth?

MR. BARTH: No. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So going back to the sentencing date, Mr. Mead, there are a number of reasons why the court imposed a guideline sentence. There was a request for a non-guideline sentence. And generally the court's practice is first to assess where the guidelines fall. What's the sentence required by the guidelines or suggested by the guidelines, and then makes a separate analysis as to whether or not a non-guideline sentence would be more appropriate.

So when I did that, I made an analysis that based upon who was before me at that particular moment a sentence of 130 months was relevant. So it was appropriate. It was not greater than necessary to accomplish the purposes in sentencing.

So when one comes back for resentencing, one doesn't necessarily go to the bottom line of the guidelines when one imposed the guideline sentence initially. At the point at which you were in this courtroom that sentence I felt appropriate.

Now, of course, four points have been reduced from the guideline range. But more than that, you've made what appears to be a significant change in your life. And what's interesting about that fact is that you made it without necessarily knowing that you would be

back before the court. You know, maybe a light went off, maybe you came to a recognition that you should be a father again, maybe you came to a recognition that it's time to decide not to spend the rest of your life in prison. Regardless, I went through your records, clearly you've made adjustment. And the court is going to make not only a sentence toward -- below the bottom of the guidelines, but a mild variance. One of the things that I think is really important is that you participate in the 500-hour program so that you learn the skills to be able to adjust to pressures in life without returning to drugs when you're released to the community.

And as a result, the court is going to impose a sentence of 84 months which is below the guideline range. And I do that because it means that you've got plenty of time to prepare for your release, it means that you can get into the 500-hour program, although I doubt very much you would get credit for that, but that you could begin to plan for your reentry.

At the same time, this was an extraordinarily serious offense. You were found in possession of guns or having sold guns that had been stolen from two different residences just that morning.

And with your criminal history of 21 points in possession and then distributing guns, that's just an extraordinarily

serious offense. So the court is -- based upon really what you've earned from your behavior at Petersburg -- going to make that adjustment below the guideline range, modest though it is, but with the idea that you begin the process of planning your reentry.

So the court finds as follows: The offense of violating the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act in violation of 18 USC section 2250 and possession of stolen firearms in violation of 18 USC section 922(j), 924(a)(2), occurred from in or about December of 2010 to the fall of 2010. The guidelines apply. Are you standing -- oh, you're standing for a reason?

MR. BARTH: He can't stand because he'll be off the screen.

THE COURT: So you're going to stand.

Okay. Counts I and II of the indictment do not meet the grouping criteria and thus will be considered separately.

Count I, this is the SORNA offense. The guideline for this offense is found in section 2A3.5. The Defendant was required to register as a tier-two sex offender. Base offense level is 14. Specific offense characteristics do not apply.

Count II, possession of stolen firearms. The guideline for this offense is found in 2K2.1. The

Defendant committed the instant offense subsequent to sustaining at least one felony conviction for a crime of violence which results in a base offense level of 20. Specific events characteristics apply. There is a six level adjustment, four levels based upon the number of firearms, 8 to 24. And two levels for the fact that the firearms were stolen. So the adjusted offense level is 26.

Pursuant to multiple count adjustments one unit is assigned. The combined adjusted offense level remains at 26. The Defendant has demonstrated acceptance of responsibility. Three level reduction to 23. The Defendant has a total of 21 criminal history points resulting in a criminal history category of six, and the guideline range is 92 to 115 months.

Authorized term of supervised release is five years to life. The court grants the Defendant's request for a non-guideline sentence, adjusts the sentence to 84 months.

It is the sentence of the court that

Defendant be committed to the custody of the federal

Bureau of Prisons for 42 months on Count I and 42 months
on Count II, each to be run consecutively for a total of

84 months to be followed by a five-year term of supervised
release. Conditions of supervised release are as follows:

The Defendant shall not commit any crimes; federal, state or local. The Defendant shall not possess any illegal or controlled substances. The Defendant shall abide by the standard conditions of supervision recommended by the sentencing commission. He shall not possess a firearm or other dangerous weapon. The Defendant shall participate in a program approved by the U.S. Probation Office for substance abuse, which program may include testing to determine whether the Defendant has reverted to the use of drugs or alcohol. He shall contribute to the cost of services rendered in an amount to be determined by the probation officer, based on ability to pay or the availability of third-party payment. He shall refrain from the use of alcohol and other intoxicants during and after treatment.

The Defendant shall participate in a mental health program approved by the U.S. Probation Office. The Defendant shall contribute to the cost of services rendered in an amount to be determined by the probation officer, based on ability to pay or the availability of third-party payment. He shall refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance and submit to a drug test within 15 days of release, on supervised release, and at least two periodic drug tests thereafter for use of a controlled substance. He shall not possess images or

videos of the victims' sexually explicit conduct involving adults, child pornography or visual or text content involving minors which has sexual, prurient or violent interests as an inherent purpose. He shall avoid and is prohibited from being in any areas or locations where children are likely to congregate such as schools, day care facilities, playgrounds, theme parks, arcades, recreational facilities or recreation parks unless prior approval has been obtained from the probation office. He shall register as a sex offender in any state where the Defendant resides, is employed, performs volunteer service, carries out a vocation or as a student as required by law.

He shall not associate or have contact directly or indirectly with persons under the age of 18 except in the presence of a responsible adult who is aware of the nature of the Defendant's background, and who has been approved in advance by the probation officer. He may not use sexually-oriented telephone numbers or services. He shall submit his person and any property, house, residence, vehicle, papers, computer, other electronic communications or data storage devices, or media and effects to search at any time with or without a warrant by any law enforcement or probation officer with reasonable suspicion concerning a violation of a condition of

supervised release, probation, or unlawful conduct by the person and by any probation officer in the unlawful discharge of the officer's supervision functions. Such searches may include the removal of such items for the purpose of conducting a more thorough inspection. The Defendant shall inform the other residents of this condition. Failure to submit to a search may be grounds for revocation.

The Defendant shall cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by the probation officer.

Now the court's going to recommend the following. First, that the Defendant participate in the 500-hour drug and alcohol rehabilitation program sponsored by the Bureau of Prisons. If he has not successfully completed the program, if there is any other program other than the one that he's already successfully completed, because I reviewed the certificate of completion, then he shall participate in that program.

Second, that he should be released to -- what is the town in Pennsylvania? Do you have that?

MR. MEAD: Selinsgrove, I believe.

THE COURT: Okay. Feelinsgrove?

MR. MEAD: Selins with a S.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BARTH: Your Honor, I certainly can get

you that information. I was looking in my notes. I don't have that information.

Pennsylvania. It may not be that particular town. He should be released in Pennsylvania. By the way, there was some reference in your materials, those 18 pages, to some finding by this court that you not be released to Vermont. I don't recall that specifically, but if that was, in fact said, it would have been because you had no connection to the state any longer. Apparently your mother is here at this point. So --

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{MR.}}$ MEAD: I do have family in Vermont and New York, sir.

THE COURT: Right. I didn't mean to suggest that that was taken -- to be taken as a bar to you being released to Vermont.

MR. MEAD: It does say for me not to go to New York or Vermont. I never understood that.

THE COURT: Well that may have been -- -- I don't recall that specifically. But my sense is that that may have been because of your mother not being present at that point, but I certainly do not intend to bar you being released to Vermont or New York State, especially in light of the changes that you've made.

But having said that, it seems to me that

you've got a good plan to be reintegrated into the community in Pennsylvania, so I'm encouraging that to be said. But it's not a bar to Vermont.

MR. MEAD: Okay. Thank you.

THE COURT: The guideline fine range is 10,000 to \$500,000. Demonstrated an inability to pay a fine. All fines are waived. Special assessment of \$200 is imposed due immediately. Has that been paid?

MR. BARTH: I actually don't know. Terry, are you paying the \$200 to the inmate restitution program?

MR. MEAD: Yeah. I've already paid that.

Completed.

THE COURT: Okay. Both the Defendant and the Government may have the right to appeal this sentence as set forth in Title 18 USC section 3742. If the Defendant is unable to pay the cost of appeal, he has the right to apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis and request the court to appoint counsel for him. If the Defendant so requests, the clerk of court shall prepare and file forthwith a notice of appeal on behalf of the Defendant. Notice of appeal by the Defendant must be filed within 14 days of the date judgment is entered on the Docket pursuant to rule 4(b) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.

Now we had worked out the rough time when

above-entitled matter.

24

23

25

